because when and if the case reaches the appellate court there is apparently no relief for this defendant against whom the judge has directed a verdict. While the majority of courts hold you can't direct a verdict it is still possible, and the appellate courts approve it, for a judge to command that a jury return a verdict.

I would like to read from the Horning case that

Delegate Weidemeyer cited, because this is the Supreme

Court's most recent word on what a judge has power to do,

and it is an interesting decision because Justice Holmes --

THE CHAIRMAN: Your time has expired.

DELEGATE BOTHE: May I read one paragraph, because I want the Delegates to know what the Supreme Court says is an appropriate direction to a jury?

THE CHAIRMAN: Proceed.

DELEGATE BOTHE: That judge said, and the Supreme Court said it was all right, "In conclusion, I will say to you" -- that is the members of the jury -- "that failure by you to bring in a verdict in this case can arise only from a flagrant disregard of the evidence and the law as I have given it to you and a violation